```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                       FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
                             NORTHERN DIVISION
2
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
3
               Plaintiff,
4
          VS.
                                           CRIMINAL NO.:
5
     CHRISTOPHER KENJI BENDANN,
                                           1:23-cr-00278-JKB-1
6
               Defendant.
7
8
                                           Baltimore, Maryland
                                           January 21, 2025
9
                                           1:00 p.m.
10
                         TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                   SENTENCING HEARING (WITH REDACTIONS)
11
                   BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES K. BREDAR
                               Courtroom 5A
12
13
     For the Government:
14
          COLLEEN E. McGUINN, Esquire
          KIM Y. HAGAN, Esquire
15
            Office of the United States Attorney
            36 South Charles Street, 4th Floor
16
            Baltimore, MD 21201
17
     For the Defendant:
18
          CHRISTOPHER C. NIETO, Esquire
            Nieto Law Office
19
            233 E. Redwood Street, Suite 1000C
            Baltimore, MD 21202
20
          GARY E. PROCTOR, Esquire
21
            The Law Office of Gary E. Proctor, LLC
            233 E. Redwood Street. Suite 1000C
22
            Baltimore, MD 21202
23
                     Special Agents Calista Walker, Rachel Corn, FBI
     Also Present:
24
                    Paige Cameron, U.S. Probation
25
          (Computer-aided transcription of stenotype notes)
```

PROCEEDINGS

2 | (1:08 p.m.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Be seated, please. The Government will call the case.

MS. McGUINN: Yes, Your Honor. Good afternoon.

Assistant United States Attorney Colleen McGuinn on behalf of the Government calling United States of America versus

Christopher Kenji Bendann, Criminal Case No. JKB-23-278. Your Honor, standing to my right is my co-counsel Kim Hagan and standing to her right are Special Agents Rachel Corn and Calista Walker with the FBI.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. You may be seated.

Mr. Nieto.

MR. NIETO: Yes, good afternoon, Your Honor. For the record, Christopher Nieto and Gary Proctor on behalf of Mr. Bendann who is seated to my left.

THE COURT: Thank you. I recognize Mr. Bendann, of course, from his earlier appearances before me. Good afternoon. Mr. Proctor.

MR. PROCTOR: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Beginning on the 21st of August of last year, the defendant appeared before the Court for a jury trial. At the conclusion of that proceeding, he was found guilty on all counts. Upon the findings of guilt, the Court ordered preparation of a presentence report. Sentencing was ultimately

```
scheduled for today. Is the Government ready for sentencing?
1
               MS. McGUINN: Yes, Your Honor.
2
               THE COURT: Mr. Nieto, is the defendant ready?
3
               MR. NIETO: Yes, Your Honor.
4
               THE COURT: You and your client and Mr. Proctor may
5
    move up to the forward podium.
6
          Good afternoon, Mr. Bendann. Have you and your lawyers
7
     read and discussed the presentence report, including any
8
     revisions that might have been made after the report was
9
     initially disclosed to you?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. Nieto, can you confirm that you and
12
    your client have read and discussed the presentence report and
13
     any revisions?
14
               MR. NIETO: Yes, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: Tell me now about any objections you have
16
    with respect to the content of the report post any revisions
17
    and as it stands before the Court currently, including any
18
    differences you have with the probation officer's computation
19
    of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines.
20
               MR. NIETO: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. As we had
21
    and was noted in the final presentence report, we did have some
22
    objections to the computations of the guidelines in this case,
23
     some on more general policy terms but others as they are
24
     applicable in the context of this particular matter.
25
```

THE COURT: You can stand on those written submissions if you wish. I have reviewed them carefully. But you can also advocate your position with respect to one or more of those if you care to.

MR. NIETO: No, Your Honor. I will submit on my filings on that matter.

THE COURT: Okay. I hope that defense counsel will monitor my review of the subject of the guideline computations to make sure that I don't miss any of the issues that you have raised, but fundamentally they're in three categories.

The first is that you contend that the upward adjustment reflective of a custodial arrangement or relationship between Mr. Bendann and the Minor Victim is inappropriate, and you make a specific point or accusation about when the videos in particular were made and whether or not at those moments it's fair to say under the law that the Minor Victim was in the custody of the defendant within the meaning of United States Sentencing Guideline 2G2.1(b)(5).

Having reviewed the arguments, those of the Government, reflected on the evidence that was presented in the trial and the totality of the record, I find that there was a custodial relationship; that the entire relationship between the defendant and the Minor Victim was born in a custodial environment; that the Minor Victim's parents placed the defendant in the defendant's custody in middle school and

identified the defendant as a trusted adult whom their child was authorized to call upon for help, for assistance, for advice, and for mentorship; and that that relationship with the parents' complete approval and delegation of authority, if that's what's necessary here, continued all the way through the upper school until the defendant reached majority. 2G2.1(b)(5) speaks not just of custody but also of supervisory control and I find that on the totality of the record presented at trial, Mr. Bendann was in a supervisory, custodial role with respect to the Minor Victim and others but significantly, for purposes of this hearing, the Minor Victim during all relevant periods. So the defendant's objection on that ground is overruled.

The defendant objects to the application of 2G2.1(b)(6)(B), the so-called computer adjustment. I fully understand the points made by defense counsel. Computers and related devices are ubiquitous in our society, and the notion that one was employed to assist the completion of an offense is almost like saying that a defendant when committing an offense wore clothing or had a coat on or something like that. It's perhaps slightly more than that because it's an instrumentality of the crime, but it is a tool that is so much a part of our lives at this point that I think one can reasonably question the appropriateness of the Sentencing Commission continuing to list the use of or the presence of a computer or similar device as an aggravating factor in a case.

But that's really not for the Court to decide. The Commission has been delegated that authority, and they continue to carry that provision on their books in the sentencing guidelines, and the provision squarely applies in this case. The crime couldn't have been committed without the use of such a device here.

So while I understand defense counsel's point, the fact is 2G2.1(b)(6)(B), to the extent that any guideline is the law of the land, this remains the law of the land, so that objection is overruled.

Then, lastly, defense counsel objects to the -- he doesn't phrase it this way but really what he portrays as sort of a double counting process that occurs by virtue of sex offenses of this sort being subject to an enhancement for a pattern of activity, then further enhancement in the multiple count computation, and then there's a chapter 4 further enhancement as a result of a pattern being proven. Once again, there is argument I, think particularly with respect to the last point, credible argument, but these guidelines have been computed meticulously and competently and correctly by the probation officer; and as Mr. Nieto himself noted a moment ago, a lot of this is policy objection that he has with respect to how the Commission regards some of these offenses.

I find the guidelines were appropriately computed in that regard, and so that third objection is also overruled.

```
Mr. Nieto, have I now addressed all of your guideline
1
    objections?
2
               MR. NIETO: You have, Your Honor.
3
               THE COURT: Very well then. Are there any requests
4
     by the Government or defense counsel for departures upward or
5
     downward? First the Government.
6
               MS. McGUINN: Not from the Government, Your Honor.
7
               THE COURT: Mr. Nieto.
8
               MR. NIETO: No. Your Honor.
9
               THE COURT: No departures upward or downward are
10
     appropriate in the Court's view either. Accordingly, none will
11
     be applied.
12
          Well, one of the requirements in every federal sentencing
13
     hearing is that the Court, relatively near the beginning of the
14
     process, on the record compute the Federal Sentencing
15
    Guidelines and make findings as to how they should apply in a
16
     particular case. In this case I have carefully reviewed the
17
    guideline computation set out by the probation officer in the
18
     presentence report, Document No. 169, beginning essentially at
19
     about page 7 and then continuing on after that. And I conclude
20
    that the probation officer has computed the guidelines
21
     correctly, and I adopt that computation as the Court's own
22
    going forward.
23
          Reviewing in a somewhat summary fashion, sexual
24
    exploitation of a child is an offense when there are multiple
25
```

instances that don't group. They are each their own group.

Accordingly, we have five groups where the base offense level is 32.

The offense involved the commission of a sexual act or sexual contact so there's a two-level increase.

A computer was used or an interactive computer service was employed; that's a two-level increase.

And then the significant issue that we discussed which was the custodial issue, I also rule that the probation officer is correct on that as well.

So accordingly, we start with a 32, we have upward adjustments of six points, bringing us to a 38. And that computation applies across all five of the sexual exploitation counts.

Then we move to the three counts for possession of child pornography and they are each computed -- well, they group. So we pull them all together, we have a base offense level of 18. There was a pattern of activity involving the sexual abuse or exploitation of a minor. There's a five-level upward adjustment to reflect that.

The offense, again, involved the use of a computer or interactive computer service. That's a two-level upward adjustment.

Then because of the number of images, there's an upward adjustment of five, and that brings us to a total of 30.

```
The cyberstalking of a minor victim is its own group and
1
     the base offense level is 18; a two-level upward adjustment
2
     because there was a pattern of activity involving the stalking,
3
     threatening, harassing or assaulting of the same victim which
4
     brings us to a 20.
5
          It was a complicated multiple count adjustment which is
6
     explained on page 12. I've checked it, found it is correct and
7
     adopt it.
8
          And the result of all of this is that there's a combined
9
     adjusted offense level of 43. There's the chapter 4
10
     enhancement that we referred to a few moments ago that brings
11
     with it five more levels; we're at a 48.
12
          There's been no evidence of an acceptance of
13
     responsibility by the defendant. Accordingly, no downward
14
     adjustments under § 3E1.1. I said we were at a tentative sum
15
     of 48, but the sentencing guidelines end or top out at 43.
16
     Accordingly, I find that the defendant's offense level is 43.
17
          One last time, is there any objection to the Court's
18
     computation of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines? First from
19
     the Government?
20
               MS. McGUINN: No, Your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: And then from the defendant?
22
               MR. NIETO: Your Honor, just as we had noted
23
     originally.
24
```

Right.

THE COURT:

25

```
MR. NIETO: But understanding the Court's ruling,
1
     no.
2
               THE COURT:
                           Right. And those issues are preserved
3
     because you have noted them.
4
          Ms. McGuinn, are there any victims that wish to address
5
     the Court?
6
               MS. McGUINN: Yes, Your Honor. The Minor Victim's
7
     mother and father both wish to address the Court on behalf of
8
    their child.
9
               THE COURT: Mr. Nieto, you and your client and your
10
    colleague may be seated.
11
               MR. PROCTOR: Your Honor, we had previously filed a
12
    motion to strike impermissible victim impact. Your Honor has
13
     ruled and found that the Court has wide latitude to consider
14
     it. I don't know obviously what these witnesses are going to
15
     say. Would you like me to object every time, or can we have a
16
     continuing objection as outlined in our earlier pleading?
17
               THE COURT: You can have a continuing objection,
18
    Mr. Proctor, and I certainly understand your point. But I know
19
    that you understand my interpretation of the law. § 3662
20
     brings with it virtually no restrictions on what may be
21
     presented at a sentencing hearing. A better way I think to
22
    express how the law operates in this environment -- and this is
23
     in terminology that lawyers will understand, lay people maybe
24
     less.
            But the information presented at a sentencing hearing
25
```

```
effectively is all admissible. It's just a question of the weight that the Court is going to afford a particular information.
```

Let me assure you and your client that while the Court will give great weight to the information that it acquired through the presentation of evidence during the trial of this case and will listen carefully to all of the submissions that are made orally during the sentencing hearing and has read carefully all of the written information that has otherwise been submitted, you can be sure that I understand how proof works and that that which is submitted to the Court with less corroboration, not in person, not subject to cross-examination, will be accorded appropriately less weight than that which I did hear myself, that considerable volume of evidence that I heard and which was subject to cross-examination and all of the tests that the rules of evidence call for, tests that that evidence passed.

MR. PROCTOR: I understand, Your Honor. I just didn't want to be jumping up a dozen times if I could have a continuing objection. I don't expect you to change your ruling.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Proctor.

Ms. McGuinn. Who wishes to present first?

MS. McGUINN: I believe would like to present first.

```
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, please come forward.
1
                             Would Your Honor have her come here?
               MS. McGUINN:
2
               THE COURT: Yes, she should come to the forward
3
     podium, and you can stand with her, Ms. McGuinn.
4
               MS. McGUINN: Yes, Your Honor.
5
               THE COURT: Good afternoon, ma'am.
6
               VICTIM'S MOTHER: Good afternoon.
7
               THE COURT: I recognize you from your earlier
8
     appearance in this courtroom, but nonetheless please begin by
9
     identifying yourself and tell me what it is that you want to
10
     say.
11
               VICTIM'S MOTHER: Sure.
                                        My name is
12
     I am the mother of the victim in this case.
13
               THE COURT: You may proceed.
14
               VICTIM'S MOTHER: Okay. I have written a letter that
15
     I choose to share with you today in person.
16
          Judge Bredar, my hope is that our family statement will
17
     convey the profound and far-reaching impact of the defendant,
18
     Christopher Kenji Bendann's actions which include sexual abuse
19
     of a minor, cyberstalking, grooming of a minor, and blackmail.
20
     The crimes committed by the defendant have irrevocably altered
21
     our son's life while also inflicting deep emotional wounds on
22
     our family. Wounds that will likely take a lifetime to heal,
23
     if they ever do.
24
          Sexual abuse of a minor is one of the most egregious
25
```

violations imaginable. It shatters the innocence and sense of safety that every child deserves. When we learned that evil had infiltrated our son's life, we could not have imagined the actual depth of emotional and psychological damage inflicted upon him by the defendant. While our son had already endured years of abuse, our family had just begun to comprehend his trauma while processing our own guilt, grief, remorse and feelings of helplessness.

When the defendant was arrested on February 3, 2023, our son still faced an uncertain future overshadowed by exploitation, manipulation and fearmongering. The defendant's complete lack of remorse and refusal to take accountability, particularly as the legal proceedings unfolded, was striking. Showing complete disregard for our son's well-being, the defendant relentlessly exposed our son to further trauma. The scars from years of abuse were now manifesting themselves in countless ways, affecting our son's ability to form healthy relationships, succeed in school, and navigate a future with confidence.

Your Honor, it is not just the -- it is not just about the crimes themselves but about the ongoing harm that was inflicted by the defendant's decision to fight back in the ways that he did. The contrast between what could have been a path to healing for our son and instead choosing to escalate and double down on his defense highlights the depths of narcissism and his

complete lack of remorse. The defendant's decision to take aggressive actions was not just a legal maneuver; it was personal retribution, continuing the cycle of power and control.

The defendant's choice to hold press conferences in order to proclaim his innocence while publicly dismissing, in quotes, "the one whining anonymous victim" was a calculation -- a calculated assertion of power. His actions were about continuing the abuse, maintaining control, and making sure our son felt powerless and vulnerable. The defendant was deliberate and calculated, serving to prolong the trauma for our son.

During this gut-wrenching time, our son was focused on mustering the courage to face and prosecute his abuser. Yet even while incarcerated, the defendant managed to further escalate his abusive behaviors. He and his legal team hired private investigators to try to discredit and smear our son's character while employing intimidation tactics towards family and friends.

While home alone one evening, one friend was confronted by a private investigator sent by the defendant to terrify, frighten and intimidate. In a desperate move, the defendant and his team subpoenaed our son in the hopes that this action would instill fear and dissuade him from taking the stand against his abuser. The depraved and criminal behaviors of the

defendant are staggering. His predatory, criminal and destructive actions only are supplemented by his desire for personal retribution against our son and our family while behind bars.

Fragility is our son's new normal. Both he and our family cope with emotional trauma, pain, and cruel uncertainty, all while trying to piece together the fragments of shattered lives. Incidents of sexual abuse occurred within our family home, making it unbearable to remain there, so in 2023 we sold our home because the one place that should have been a sanctuary for our son was instead a haunting reminder.

Upon learning of our son's abuse at the hands of the defendant, I was unable to return to work. I could not bring myself to walk the halls or carry on my duties in the wake of my son's suffering. My husband persevered, continuing his employment. Unfortunately while trying to provide for our family, he faced unimaginable stress. My husband suffered a life-threatening internal bleed and spent 21 days in the intensive care unit. After being discharged, he remained out of work for over a year. My husband, he defied the odds in recovery and continued to fight his greatest battle to protect our son.

When charging documents were filed and subsequent articles printed, our son's identity was revealed, despite assurances from authorities that his anonymity would be protected. This

breach of trust revictimized our son, begging the question of why any victim of child sexual abuse should come forward if their identity is not safeguarded. The gravity of the defendant's actions cannot be overstated. The emotional and psychological damage inflicted upon our son and thereby our family is profound. The defendant's predatory behavior knows no boundaries as materially evidenced by the trial. He has shown no remorse. In fact, he took one last opportunity to demonstrate his deviant behavior following the verdict. Upon exiting the courtroom, he looked over at us and tauntingly uttered, "I forgive you."

In light of these repulsive actions, the defendant did not break our son, and he will never break our family. Your Honor, the defendant is a depraved narcissist who can no longer prey, groom, abuse or blackmail young boys, thanks in large part to the young men who have stood up to this monster and said no more.

Locking up the defendant for the maximum time permitted would not only be an act of justice for our son but also a necessary step to ensure the safety of our children. The Court has a sacred duty to protect the most vulnerable members of our society, and that duty must be upheld.

We cannot allow this monster to continue his reign of terror, and we must send a message that such heinous acts will be met with the full force of the law. Your Honor, please

```
ensure justice by jailing the defendant, the depraved
1
     narcissist, the monster, for the maximum sentencing allowed.
2
    Thank you.
3
          Respectfully submitted by the parents of our beautiful and
4
     courageous son.
5
               THE COURT: You may be seated.
6
              VICTIM'S MOTHER: Thank you.
7
              MS. McGUINN: Your Honor,
8
               THE COURT: Yes, please come forward. Do you want to
9
     speak on your feet, or do you want to be seated?
10
               VICTIM'S FATHER: This is fine, Your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Okay. First of all, begin by telling us
12
    your name for the record.
13
              VICTIM'S FATHER: My name is
                                            : I'm the
14
    father of the victim.
15
               THE COURT: What is it you would like to say to the
16
    Court this afternoon?
17
               VICTIM'S FATHER: The Honorable Judge Bredar, I am
18
    the father of the victim. And while I initially planned for my
19
    wife's words to fully express the horror my family has endured,
20
    there are three critical points in the defense's letter I could
21
    not leave unaddressed. Truthfully, there are so many more.
22
          The defense attempts to portray the defendant as an
23
    outstanding mentor, teacher and individual, referring to
24
    accolades such as Mentor of the Year awards in 2018 and '19 and
25
```

stating "By every account, he was an amazing teacher and well respected by everyone he met." Let me be clear. In 2018 and 2019 when Chris received these awards, he was actively grooming and abusing multiple victims, including my son.

I can see Chris sitting there that day getting the honor, smiling and thinking he's just the best thing in the world for these kids and for the school, only to turn around hours later and exploit the trust of those he was entrusted to protect, sending requests for explicit images and engaging in unspeakable acts against the very children he was supposed to mentor.

Chris is not an amazing teacher. He is a predator.

Pedophiles gravitate to places where children are: schools,
camps, Scouts. Chris used his privilege to infiltrate Gilman,
bypassing the usual credentials, as he highlighted in his
letter, and once inside, he weaponized his position to
manipulate, exploit and destroy innocent lives.

Contrary to the defense's claims, not everyone who encountered him would say he was well respected. In fact, most would now call him a privileged, narcissistic pedophile which is the truth, and there were plenty of people in school who were worried about his behavior.

Secondly and perhaps most disturbingly, Chris has shown no remorse, as my wife mentioned. Not once, not once has he accepted responsibilities for his actions. While he mouthed

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the words "I forgive you" to my wife and I after his conviction, this was not an admission of guilt. It was just another display of manipulation and narcissism. I can't believe he did that to us, thought he could get away with that.

The defense's letter repeatedly refers to his crimes with detached phrases like "the defendant was convicted of," "the evidence adduced," carefully avoiding any acknowledgment of the devastating reality he inflicted on our family. Chris's refusal to take responsibility forced our son and our entire family through many years of anguish that will continue. By insisting on trial, he prolonged our suffering, stealing precious years from our lives, and depleting personal and governmental resources that could have been better spent elsewhere. He could have admitted his guilt and spared us further pain from public scrutiny, but instead he chose to maintain control just as he always has. Chris used his role as a -- trusted role as a mentor, one of society's most valued positions, to disguise his true nature: a manipulative self-serving predator of minors which is one of society's worse creations.

The trauma Chris inflicted on our son and family and countless other victims will not fade in 20 years the defense is hoping for. It will last a lifetime, well beyond the combined years of the victim's sufferings. Victims of child

abuse carry scars forever. The mere thought of Chris being released and having another opportunity to inflict harm is terrifying. I implore you to ensure that he is never granted the chance.

Lastly, I kept thinking why should he get any reduction when he chose to push us to trial? Our society is forgiving for those who make mistakes and have remorse and issue sincere apologies, and a reduced sentence prior to the trial would have made sense as it would have saved so many people anguish and distress. But he went all in and he pushed all of us. Our society should not reward or forgive those who don't admit mistakes, show remorse, especially when seeking a reduced sentence for something as horrible as child abuse. I personally can't believe he won't show something when given the opportunity because he is a master manipulator, but as the letter showed, he has no remorse for the evidence adduced at the trial.

Thank you, Your Honor, for your time and consideration. I ask that justice be served and that Chris be held fully accountable for his unfathomable breach of trust and the immeasurable pain he has caused. Thank you.

THE COURT: You may be seated, Mr.

Are there any other statements or victim presentations that the Government wishes to sponsor, Ms. McGuinn?

MS. McGUINN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll hear from the Government next on the question of what sentence should be imposed. Ms. McGuinn.

MS. McGUINN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, as the Government indicated in its written sentencing memorandum, the Government is seeking a sentence of 35 years. The Government feels that is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, in this case. That number derives from a 30-year maximum sentence as to child exploitation if those five counts were to run concurrent with one another, plus a five-year sentence for the cyberstalking, that additional behavior on top of the sexual abuse that was endured by Minor Victim during these years.

Your Honor, I'm going to shuffle the sentencing factors a little bit from the traditional order. I wanted to start first with the need to avoid sentencing disparities. The defense raised a few cases in their memorandum that the Government wanted to mention, but first and foremost, as Your Honor knows, the Fourth Circuit has held more than once that disparity of sentencing, which I would argue is probably one of the more difficult factors because Your Honor is charged with handling Mr. Bendann's case individually and addressing all of his factors and all of the case factors. It is different from every other case Your Honor has seen, so it can't be done in a case-by-case comparison apples to oranges, and the Fourth Circuit has recognized that.

However, the defense has brought forth two cases in particular that I personally handled and a third case that Ms. Hagan handled that Your Honor I know is familiar with because you were the judge. The first two are the United States versus Evan Frock which was handled by me in front of Judge Hurson. First of all, it was a plea. There were no hands-on abuses in that particular case. It was all online exploitation. And while, yes, Mr. Frock himself was a substitute teacher in Carroll County and a volleyball coach, he pretended to be an age-mate of the children that he abused which is starkly different and stands in direct contrast to what this defendant did. Again, it's hard to make that apples-to-apples, apples-and-oranges comparison, but Mr. Frock also accepted responsibility early and pled guilty.

Lewis Blandon was also a Baltimore public middle school teacher. He exploited teenagers online and it should be noted none of them were in Maryland and/or students of his. He had a hands-on abuse with a cousin from 20 years prior to these offenses when he himself was only 20 years old. In all of these cases — on his counts, he met those individuals online and in one event did engage in hands-on abuse, but that child was 17 and of the age of consent; also different because he did not coerce or threaten or do anything of that nature to get that child to engage in sexual intercourse with him, and he was not charged with that because that part was not a crime.

Again, that case was not a trial, and but for the abuse of his cousin when he himself was 20 years old, 20 years prior to those offenses, it was not the same type of hands-on abuse that we see here.

Lastly, counsel raised the RICO case that I know Your Honor is aware that Ms. Hagan handled, Davante Harrison.

Again, as Your Honor is aware of that case, as with so many of our RICO cases that take place in Baltimore City, is an entirely different calculus. There are issues involving witnesses, snitches, individuals who are in jail. And in that case, if I'm correct, Mr. Harrison did not plead to anything that involved he himself committed a murder -- is that correct, Ms. Hagan? Thank you, I wanted to make sure I said that correctly. On top of that, Your Honor, I know that was placed on the record before Your Honor, there were a lot of evidence concerns in that case that was a huge litigation risk and, yes, he received 25 years. That is vastly different than where we are today.

Here, the Government proved all nine counts beyond a reasonable doubt at a trial. There are no evidence issues. There are no witness concerns. There are no victim concerns. It's done. The Government did not negotiate a plea to keep anybody protected or to make sure evidence wasn't lost or to protect victims. This was a trial. And the defendant stands guilty of all nine counts.

Your Honor, as to the nature and circumstances of the offense and history of the defendant, I know that Your Honor has read the Government sentencing memorandum, but I do want to highlight a few portions of that as the Government feels it's probably the more important aspects that we would like for Your Honor to consider. The minor victim in this case was only 14 years old when the grooming began. The defendant started calling him "puppy" at that time which, as Your Honor saw in trial, became more and more degrading as Minor Victim got older. This began in 2015 and it didn't end until 2022 so roughly seven, eight years of abuse and exploitation and degradation and humiliation and threatening and exploitation at the hands of this man.

He knew Minor Victim's particular vulnerabilities when he took him on as an advisee, knowing he had to repeat a grade in a different school; he was coming back and he had one foot in middle school, one foot in high school in the sense that all his friends were there; that he had a lower self-esteem; that he was struggling with his grades. He knew those things and knew that Mr. and Mrs. ______, thinking that they were doing the absolute best thing for their child, had requested him to help them. He had unfettered access to Minor Victim to start sending him text messages when he was just a 14-year-old kid.

"Did you see me today? Did you see me waving at you? Do you want to come to my office or classroom before? Do you want

to get breakfast with me? Do you want to go out to dinner?"
That was Government's Exhibit 122 at trial which was the 2015
messages taken from the defendant's iPhone 7 chat that he
didn't even realize was saved in a backup directory on his own
computer. That whole exhibit was 330 pages and roughly 220
messages in about an 18-month time span. I say that because
when we get to the cyberstalking, you'll see how different it
becomes.

Those messages from FaceTime, offers to help him, take him places, wanted to know what songs he likes to hear, asking if he wanted to go to dinner and expressing disappointment when he can't go; this is not a normal or acceptable teacher behavior with a 14-year-old. That was grooming and was targeting, and it was manipulative. Those chats, from what we had or were able to procure, ended on July 20 of 2017. If you fast-forward three and four months later, that's where Count 1 begins because as Minor Victim testified, that's when things started to just get really bad.

Naked rides home. "I'll give you a ride home from this party that I pick you up from, but you need to be naked in the car" which turns into "you need to do these sexual acts to yourself in the car." Which eventually evolved into Count 3 which, in my mind when I try to keep track of what happens in all of the accounts, I call that one the sad shower video. If Your Honor will recall the video we watched, Minor Victim is

slumped in the shower at his friend, the Halpert's house, and the defendant is seen in the glass just standing there and filming him. And then we progress further to the Feiss's video, Count 4, and lastly the one that occurred at his own home just before he turned 18.

If that weren't enough, that sexual abuse of a minor by a person who had been his advisor, his teacher, someone who had care of him and ultimately control of him, he heaped it on because once Minor Victim turned 18, he continued forcing him and coercing him and threatening him to keep sending him videos and images. Through the entire COVID-19 shutdown when schools weren't in session, those text messages continued. Using Snapchat later and ultimately Instagram to set up a fake account threatening him.

He was vindictive and cruel and tyrannical. In Government's Exhibit 221, which is that adult chat from May of 2022 through December of 2022 -- just to show the distance between those two time frames, that is about six months' worth of texts, Your Honor, and there were over 4,700 messages across 370 pages; that the Government only produced a snippet of them in front of the jury but the entire exhibit, as Your Honor knows, admitted into court.

You can almost have a visceral reaction to that portion of the evidence when we read on June 11 as Minor Victim went up to see his girlfriend, all of us have probably been in that

position when you get to meet a significant other's parents for the first time and what that feels like and that nervousness and that excitement, and is this person going to be a lifetime partner or a long-term partner, and you go to have dinner with those parents the first time. And here is Minor Victim getting messages: "Answer. Answer. Answer" -- excuse my language -- "fuck you. Answer. Answer me now. I'm exposing you. I'm turning it public. 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1" and you can picture each as a separate text as his phone is buzzing and buzzing and buzzing, and he's sitting there trying to live a normal 21-year-old's life and meet a girl's parents.

And you can almost have a visceral reaction to when his girlfriend did uncover sort of what happened when they were overseas, and they go to see Mr. and Mrs. and she's saying to them, "Oh, we have to buy this special tea for Mr. Bendann because he's been so good to you." And we hear how Minor Victim was acting up a bit and being rude at that lunch, and you can imagine what he and his girlfriend were going through in that moment, and they can't do or say anything and here his mother and father have no idea. They've just opened this can of worms in front of him and had no idea what they had done.

That cruel puzzle game he played involving his best friend, James Schloeder, who now has to live with the fact that this man who was his friend too -- the defendant, he looked to

him as a mentor -- and he now feels that the defendant is sending him snippets of his best friend's scrotum to play some sort of guessing game in order to get Minor Victim to comply. Mr. Schloeder had no idea that's what was going on, and now he has to live with that and know he was being used in order to get to his best friend because the defendant was playing some sort of sick game with all of them.

And we know that Minor Victim was not alone. The Government included in its sentencing memorandum information about two other victims. Your Honor is correct, neither of them are here, and in fact one of the individuals had planned to write a victim impact statement and just simply couldn't do it. That was the second individual who did not attend Gilman. But the Government presents that information to you at the preponderance standard to simply show this was not a person where this was a one-off situation. There were text messages or Snapchat, screenshots where he's grooming another kid and there are other children running naked laps, and there are other groups of kids that he is working on to try to get them to be his next full-fledged victim in the way that Minor Victim was in this case.

The defendant used his image as a pillar of the Gilman community to access these children, to access Minor Victim.

Starting with innuendo, flirting -- if we can call it that -- watching them run naked, watching him and manipulating him and

somehow convincing Minor Victim that he owed him in some way, turning it into threats, covering up for drinking, horseplay tradition. And he did all that and it wasn't the only time he attempted to do those types of things.

Your Honor, as to the need of the sentence imposed, I will agree with Mr. and Mrs. there have been no shows of remorse. There has been what the Government also saw when the defendant was standing there at the verdict and there when he was leaving the courtroom, looking at the family, particularly Mr. and Mrs. and saying "I forgive you" to them.

This sentence, Your Honor, therefore needs to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, just punishment and protect the public. The seriousness of the offense, Your Honor, is that the defendant sexually abused and exploited a student of his own. He began grooming him in 2015, and for eight years, he manipulated, humiliated, degraded, harassed, intimidated and abused him.

Your Honor, there have been any number of other sentences in this court by Your Honor, and other judges of this court and those of our counterparts in Greenbelt, where over 30 years have been given even in response to a plea. The Government's request here is not unusual given the amount of evidence, given this was a trial. And the Government feels that a sentence of 35 years adequately reflects the needs for a just sentence and reflects all the other aspects of 3553(a), that it is

will do all in my power to assist him in becoming a productive citizen as his debt to society is paid. I know that you will consider all the facts of this case in making your final sentencing decision. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.
Mr. Nieto.

MR. NIETO: Yes, Your Honor. I wanted to call Mr. Bendann's father initially just to sort of set the tone for our presentation here today. We respectfully submit a request to the Court that 240 months is a sufficient, but not greater than necessary, sentence to further the aims of 3553(a).

To address some of the things that I've heard today as well as in the Government's filings, and I know the Court knows this, but sentencings are always a challenge but even more so after trial. As the attorneys, we're limited in our presentation and in our filings, and we're restrained with what we can say because we never know what an appeal or a post-conviction may result moving forward. As the Court knows, it is the first rule of the defense to do no harm to the client's case.

Now Mr. Bendann was charged and maintained his innocence. We had a jury trial and those 12 jurors were convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that these events occurred and that Mr. Bendann committed these offenses. Today is not the day for me to relitigate any of those facts, nor do I intend to.

That's already been determined. We are only here today to determine an appropriate sentence, taking into consideration all the relevant factors that the Court -- upon which the Court must rely.

The Government has cited some factors that they consider to be aggravating that I would like to address, if I may, because I do think it's important for the Court to understand how we ended up in this position, in this post-trial capacity.

My client, Mr. Bendann, dedicated his childhood and his adult life to this community. When he was suspended and fired from his job, this was big news. This is a tightly-knit community and with the salacious nature of these charges, there was a ground swell of conjecture and rumors that were swirling around the community, a community in which my client and his family lived and were members. As those rumors were running rampant, my client could not respond to them.

When he was arrested on state charges, the experience was traumatic for everyone involved. After I was appointed in this case, I had spoken to some folks that I know professionally and personally that happen to be neighbors of the Bendanns, and when I spoke to them about the case, one of the first things they referenced was the manner in which he was arrested. As they described it, it sounded like a bomb went off.

Now Mr. Bendann and his then 78-year-old father were traumatized by that. Per our jobs, we know sadly this happens

in almost every single case but to someone with no experience with this system, the manner in which this arrest was executed is horrific. It is of course further compounded when it happens again when the federal indictment is obtained after Mr. Bendann had already been on house arrest for months.

At his state bail review, an attorney not employed by the state's attorney's office was given an audience with the bail review judge. He made various statements to her and then to the media about Mr. Bendann. Many of the things that he said were not true but he was obviously advocating for his client and, as we heard throughout the trial, a lifelong friendship with the family at the center of this case. Mr. Bendann was unable to say anything on his own behalf at that time.

To be clear, Your Honor, I'm not suggesting that lawyer overstepped his bounds. Indeed, post trial, the Government had actually intimated to me that by me doing my job through my cross-examination and closing arguments that I also victimized one of their witnesses. But we're doing our jobs. And so I understand the lawyer's approach. But to the people involved, it is still traumatic.

When anyone or anything, any creature is wounded, they may bare their teeth but that's not a sign of aggression. That's a defense mechanism, a sign of self-preservation. That ill-fated press conference on the courthouse steps was an attempt to push back on a public narrative that had already seemingly

determined Mr. Bendann's guilt before he had his day in court.

There was a consequence for that action as it contributed, I believe, to the federal indictment. And the regrettable decision for that conference, of course, only led to another talking point against Mr. Bendann, but I'd be remiss if I didn't tell the Court that's my understanding as to sort of the logic behind those decisions.

In advance of the jury verdict, Mr. Proctor and I on all our cases will try to prepare our clients for the moment in which jurors may say guilty. After 20 years of doing this job, I can tell the Court it never gets easier. It is emotional for everyone involved, specifically for my clients. To be forced to stand, surrounded by U.S. marshals, and to hear strangers determine whether you will be confined against your will within four cinder-block walls without parole for decades, to know that you will never be able to hug your father again, to feel that your life is for all intents and purposes over -- well, that is one of the worse experiences we can have on this side of the room.

Respectfully, Your Honor, Mr. Bendann did not threaten anyone but we let our emotions get the better of us. I don't offer that as an excuse, but I wanted to provide the Court an explanation and some context as to how or why these things happened.

I fear that all these factors, factors that were there before Mr. Proctor and I were part of this case, were contributing factors to the path that this case took. But additionally, one of the other factors that I think is incredibly important is what a conviction would do to Mr. Bendann's legacy at Gilman, what it would do to his father's legacy, and how invalidating this case renders all his previous good work.

When Mr. Bendann's house was raided, police found photos of Mr. Bendann with his students. They received and took notebooks that were filled with messages and notes from his students over the years. Mr. Bendann cherished these materials and kept them at his home as a positive reminder about what he was doing. Now they were obviously seized because the law enforcement thought they might have some evidentiary value, but they did have significant value to Mr. Bendann and for good reason.

I had submitted to Your Honor 100-plus pages of different notes and messages through the years. Notes in which students say: "I look up to you and have since I first met you. You're making such a positive impact in our lives. I love you. Thank you for being a great teacher, friend and mentor. Your love for the students is known throughout the school, and it has made you one of the most liked and respected teacher at Gilman. You have helped me grow as a person over the past four years.

"I kind of thought it would be cool to write you a future note so you always have a chance to look back on it. You have really developed me into an outstanding young man and you should be proud of it. Your opinion on life subjects has always made me intrigued so if you don't mind, please take time to chat with me moving forward.

"I can see by the way you interact with us that it's never about you, it's about us. You tailor yourself to bring out the best in everyone. I have come to recognize you not only as a really fun and entertaining guy but also as someone with some great wisdom. Thank you for being such a nice person to not only me but to everyone else. You are very selfless. You are a great friend. You have been an awesome friend over the past five years, and I so very much appreciate all you have done for me.

"You have been a great advisor and friend who has been one of the most influential people at Gilman to shape the man I am today. I will strive to see you more and cherish my friendship with you. You know I have loved you and have respected your leadership and the huge heart you have. I love your humor and you are a great teacher.

"Never stop being you. Boy, did your mom and dad knock it out of the park. You are a wonderful, upbeat and caring man.

Thank you for being a friend to me. I look up to you as someone who I can be. Thank you for always helping me out

whenever I needed it and keeping me on the straight path. You live such a worthwhile life. Keep being you and sharing your light.

"Thank you for being there for me when I was at my low points. You are the greatest of all time. You are a very warm-hearted person, and I wish there were more people like you in this world. You rock. I can see clearly why so many of my peers look up to you as I have learned to. You've changed my life. You have a comforting, almost therapeutic aura that everyone can feel. I appreciate your dedication to the school and to each and every student. You remain a role model in my life. Your happy attitude and zest for life always has cheered me on. You are such a funny individual and teacher. I admire your comedy and love the dedication you show to the Gilman community. I want to keep you in my life as another source of light and guidance moving forward.

"You are a special human being. You are one of the best teachers that I've ever had at Gilman, if not the best. I admire how smooth every conversation I have with you and how kind-hearted and genuine a person you are. You are a really special person. Somehow you are Gilman's older brother, father, babysitter and teacher at the same time. I think you are able to do it because you are so genuinely caring of others. You care about us more than yourself. That's amazing. Thank you for being a great friend to so many of us. I love

you and love everything you do for this school.

"So many lessons you have taught me have helped me grow as a person and I'll be forever grateful for having you as a teacher. You have always been a light in my journey through Gilman. I want to thank you for the helping hand you extended to me. Your help has changed me in so many ways. Thank you, I've made it. Your effort to get to know everyone makes you one of those unforgettable people with contagious kindness. Your teaching style and your class have had such a drastic effect on who I am as a student and for that I am grateful.

"You always encourage my growth as a student. You are an excellent teacher, a wonderful personality and an embodiment of everything Gilman stands for. I truly cannot express how grateful I am to have you in my life. Thank you. I am grateful for everything you have done for me. Whenever I return to Gilman, your office is one of my first stops. You are a kind and helpful person who always looks out for his students even after graduation. You are a special teacher that Gilman is blessed to have, and I can't thank you enough for everything you have done."

THE COURT: I've got it. Move on.

MR. NIETO: Your Honor, of course. There's many, many more. Pages and pages of these messages. This is who Christopher Bendann is. He is so much more than the conduct that has been determined in support of these charges. But

Indeed I suggest to the Court that every single one of these students who wrote these notes now questions the intent behind Mr. Bendann's leadership and care. That is horrible. To think that these students — to have these students think that they were going to be victimized as well when they were not is horrible.

But, again, I understand it, Your Honor. It's the path of least resistance. The psychology of trying to understand the incongruity between the Mr. Bendann they knew and what they know he did, it's nuanced and complicated. It's just easier to throw the bath water out with the baby rather than divide the two. And I submit to the Court that this too was a factor that led us here today and at trial.

I offer this additionally to the Court because this is a legitimate consequence of his actions, one that my client will suffer for the entirety of his life. The knowledge that all that good he did is now corrupted and cannot be returned is irrevocable.

But notwithstanding that, through my representation of Mr. Bendann, I have seen the light about which these students reference. Whilst incarcerated, the care and concern he exhibited for the other inmates at that facility. I can tell Your Honor on many a jail visit, the first half hour and 40 minutes would be dedicated to the other inmate's problems. The

Accordingly, we respectfully submit that 240 months is appropriate. The guidelines again, respectfully, Your Honor, do not give the Court true guidance, although applicable, are duplicative and arcane in some portions. In fact, they seem to enhance the guidelines two or threefold. If not, our proposed sentence would fall within the advisory guideline range. We had submitted to the Court that this proposed sentence falls within similarly charged federal cases in this district involving teacher-student relationships. To be sure, it's an inexact science. Each case is different. I just wanted to provide the Court some context for how our request was.

I also referred to a RICO case involving multiple murders that was prosecuted by Ms. Hagan in front of Your Honor as a counterweight to what the Government is seeking. Their explanation or distinguishment between that case and this case, I disagree. I disagree because the co-defendant Mr. Warren's fact patterns outline precisely what the Government knew that individual had done, Mr. Harrison. But they did not include that in their facts. They did not tell that to the Court, I presume.

1

6

9

12 13

> 14 15

> 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And with regards to the evidence in the case, Your Honor knows it's a RICO case. If an overt act is reasonably foreseeable, that is mandatory life. I knew about that case because I represented at least two potential witnesses. respectfully, I think the Government had what they needed, for whatever that's worth to the Court.

With our proposed sentence, Mr. Bendann will not be released before he is 60 years old. That age, respectfully, is important to us because we submit it as a hallmark in recidivism studies that show a significant lower risk of this ever happening again. The Court can't go back in time to protect the community; you can just focus on protecting the community moving forward. That's why again, Your Honor, this is not a case involving strangers on the internet or from the neighborhood. As Your Honor had suggested even at a detention hearing, this conduct was occurring in the darkness, but there is no darkness anymore. The fact that Mr. Bendann can never return to this community and that everyone understands and knows his adjudicated crimes, respectfully, suggests it makes it even less likely that this would happen again in the future.

There is also a period of supervised release upon the completion of that sentence. I'm not sure what the world is going to look like in 2045, but I do know he will be on supervision to prevent any future instances occurring again.

a perfect person and I don't claim to be, but I'm far from the monster that the prosecution and these families are making me out to be. I can be stubborn, I know that, and sometimes callous but one of my personal values is my own sense of integrity, and that's why we're here today talking about sentencing because I couldn't admit to something that I know I didn't do.

The prosecution in cases like this are about story telling, and I will admit that Ms. McGuinn and Ms. Hagan are very compelling story tellers. They've done a great job with the evidence that they found available to craft a particularly good narrative, albeit somewhat disingenuous, especially considering the fact that much of the exculpatory information that might have helped me, their client actually asked me to delete, as he acknowledged himself in open court.

That being said, perhaps oddly, I'm grateful for this experience. It's not to say that I'm enjoying it or that I want this to happen, but it has liberated me in a number of ways. It's taken me far from my comfort zone. I've met and befriended people that in my prior existence -- I think and said it well: Being a Gilman student, there's a sense of entitlement and elitism I grew up with. I really viewed people that were incarcerated, whether pretrial, post trial or during trial, as guilty despite the fact that they had the right to an open and fair trial.

Meeting these people, hearing their stories, I know that I was wrong today and I've appreciated that perspective. I knew as both a Gilman student and as a Gilman faculty member that our judicial system was painted in black and white, but more to the point now is I'm seeing all of the shades of gray.

I've developed confidence that I didn't know that I had. When the worst is said about you in public and you see yourself on TV routinely and you hear about yourself from other inmates, you know, it's hard to take anything much harsher than that, and the sense that I can come out stronger and still feel okay about myself despite hearing all of those words has given me a sense of confidence that allows me to move past the old portion of my life. I really felt that I was a people pleaser, living at Gilman with a sense of imposter syndrome, trying to make everybody else happy around me.

I also know now who my real friends and family are.

Although my ocean of supporters has drastically shrunk and is perhaps just a pond, that pond still has enough water in it to take care of my garden.

Judge Bredar, I understand the limitations that are placed upon you from Congress in terms of sentencing, and I also understand that the nature of this case and the evidence that Ms. McGuinn and Ms. Hagan have produced are also going to be a mitigating -- sorry, also going to be a factor. My lawyer advised against this, but I have to say I don't necessarily

have a sense of what your verdict should be. I don't necessarily think that there's a right number in my head, largely because I know I'm not guilty. I'm comfortable where I am.

In fact, the thing that I'm most worried about is just the transition from Howard County Detention Center to the next location. But as I've discovered both being an inmate at Chesapeake Detention Facility and at Howard County, once I'm in a setting -- in a jail setting, I do okay.

To the families that stand against me, I've been fortunate enough to find faith, and a favorite passage of mine comes from the Bible, Matthew 18:21. In the passage is a parable about the unforgiving servant. The message is that to be forgiven, you have to forgive those who stand against you. Now we probably disagree as to who stands in what role, but I am sincere when I say that in the future, when we examine relationships and people are able to take a look back, that I don't hold any ill will or malice against them. I have fond memories of all the experiences that I've had with these families, and I'll take that with me.

I am proud of my time at Gilman, and I stand by my earlier statements that the greatest harm comes from the lie that I was a threat to my other students. I ask them to reflect on the positive relationships we had and not the messages spread by the Gilman administration, notably including and . For

I also want to thank the COs at Chesapeake Detention

Facility and at Howard County for being kind and supportive.

The staff workers there have been amazing. I want to acknowledge my friends and tier mates at both of these facilities as well. Having the support of other people who are incarcerated, only they can understand what we go through.

And perhaps most importantly, I say this because I don't want or expect any pity or leniency. I understand where the court system lies.

Finally, I want to thank my father for the love and support that he's provided for me all my life, both of my parents. While we may not always see eye to eye, his perspective, his love and his guidance have always been important. I think the hardest thing about this whole experience for me actually was reading Jack, Susan and James Schloeder laughing about the fact that somebody who they accuse of committing these crimes must have been molested by their own parents. I found that to be one of the harsher statements in there, especially considering the fact that my parents were both wonderful to me my entire life.

Your Honor, that's all I have to say. Thank you. (Conference on the sealed record.

It is the policy of this court that every guilty plea and sentencing proceeding include a bench conference concerning whether the defendant is or is not cooperating.)

(The following was held in open court:)

THE COURT: Mr. Nieto, Mr. Proctor, the Court of Appeals requires that the sentencing court rule on any points made in mitigation and at least acknowledge the same so that there can be certainty that the sentencing was in every respect fair. The points that I believe I have heard in mitigation, Mr. Nieto, are that first, based on your oral presentation, that your client, apart from these offenses, was a much admired, productive professional at the time that he was teaching at Gilman and that he had positive healthy relationships with a vast number of students there and that you hope when the Court sentences the defendant, it considers the whole person who stands in the well, not just the crimes that cause him to be here

The second point -- and I hear your point on that and will consider the substantial presentation that you made in support of it. I have to say that it is somewhat undercut by your client's own statements, but nonetheless it's a point you've offered in mitigation, and I want to make sure that the record reflects that I have considered it.

The second I draw from your papers which is that in some detail you contend that your client, really from childhood,

suffered with identity issues, owing to his Asian ancestry and his being raised in a white Caucasian family and in a community where people of that race largely dominated the social picture. I considered carefully the points you made in that regard and how they potentially could have contributed to the defendant's wayward behavior, but ultimately my conclusion is that while life in our diverse society is generally full of challenges for people who find themselves in the racial minority or others who find that they just don't fit in for one reason or another, never can that circumstance become a license to commit crimes, especially the serious crimes that the defendant committed here and harm other innocent parties.

So I've heard the point and I have considered it and factored that into my thoughts about what is the appropriate sentence in the case. But like the first point, it -- I find -- doesn't do much work for the defendant in this process.

Are there other points in mitigation that you made in the process of representing your client that I haven't expressly addressed now?

MR. NIETO: Your Honor, I guess I would simply suggest the collateral consequences of this conviction, everything that can stem from that both here at a more local level and also with the registration and supervision, and the mandatory minimums in this matter, sentences, the loss of his

father presumably; all these different factors.

THE COURT: You've argued those well, Mr. Nieto, consistent with how you have handled this case from start to finish -- expertly, I would say, actually to the sometimes consternation of the Government and others who are deeply engaged. But our system is an adversary process. That's its design. It's on purpose, and we expect defense attorneys to perform as you and Mr. Proctor have in this case, to fight hard for your client no matter how unpopular or how difficult the facts.

So let me note that those points in mitigation were made and I heard them. The difficulty is that what you're really describing is no different from the collateral consequences that attend to any lengthy sentence. They have all kinds of impacts in a defendant's life. But I would contend that those adverse impacts are, frankly, part of the design. In street parlance, you do the crime, you do the time.

Anything else, Mr. Nieto?

MR. NIETO: No. Your Honor.

THE COURT: In sentencing the defendant, I'm required to apply the factors that are set out in Title 18 of the United States Code, § 3553(a). There are eight factors, I'll apply each of them now.

The first is the history and the characteristics of the defendant. I find that the defendant was born abroad. He's of

Asian ancestry; he was adopted in infancy and raised in a Caucasian family in north Baltimore. I find that he had a solid, even privileged upbringing with loving parents. He received a fine education, he graduated from college. He ultimately was employed at the Gilman School, the very institution that he had attended as a child and as a adolescent.

I credit the submission from defense counsel that the defendant felt alienated from his community through much of his time at Gilman and otherwise as an adolescent and young adult, although there are certainly facts and circumstances in this record that suggest that he was anything but alienated from that community. A picture from a graduation ceremony or graduation party at the Elkridge Club comes to mind where the defendant was welcomed by the community, the students, the parents with open arms and, if anything, was a central figure in that community, not an alien.

I find that the defendant was employed for years at the Gilman School where he was professionally successful and that while there may have been a blemish or two, in general, the picture is that he gained the confidence of his colleagues, his supervisors, and especially the students and their families.

The second factor -- let me also note the defendant has no prior criminal history.

The second factor that the Court's required to consider is

the nature and the circumstances of the offenses. I find consistent with the jury's verdict that the defendant sexually exploited a minor on five distinct occasions. I find that he created and possessed pornographic videos of a minor three times. I find that the defendant cyberstalked his minor victim into adulthood for years. I find that the defendant engaged in a scheme to secretly exploit and then extort the minor victim over a period of years.

I find it hard to find words to adequately describe the defendant's cruelty. His conduct was cunning, was calculated, it was cold, and the associated harm was inflicted over and over and over again. The defendant made his young victim's life hell.

No defendant is required to speak at his sentencing hearing. Defendants who have been convicted after trial are in a particularly ticklish spot when it comes to sentencing for all of the reasons ably laid out by Mr. Nieto. In a case where a defendant has proceeded to trial, the Court has no expectation of their coming before the Court and admitting guilt, and the Court holds nothing against the defendant who stands silent in those circumstances. It's his absolute right. But that's a different circumstance from what occurred here. I find that the defendant is overtly unrepentant, even defiant.

The third factor for the Court to take into account is the seriousness of the offense, the need to promote respect for the

law, the need to provide just punishment. I'll elaborate on this issue at greater length in a moment, but for now let us note that the crimes were deeply serious because of the harms that were inflicted as well as the trust that was broken.

Fourth, the Court is required to consider the need for deterrence. Like most judges, I divide the concept of deterrence into two segments: specific deterrence and general deterrence. We sentence defendants with both concepts in mind. Specific deterrence is those elements of a sentence that are calculated and designed to dissuade or deter the individual defendant from engaging in this sort of criminal conduct in the future.

I find that in this case, particularly after the defendant has given us an insight into his perspective on the crimes that he committed, that it's necessary that the Court impose a sufficiently severe penalty to dissuade the defendant from ever committing another offense against a child.

General deterrence is the term that we apply to the need for a Court to impose a sentence that communicates with the wider community, not just the individual who's being sentenced, but that part of the sentence that makes a statement to the wider community about the severity of the offense and hopefully accomplishing the purpose of dissuading others who are similarly situated, who might be contemplating similar criminal conduct, from ever engaging in it, from ever actually acting on

it. The Court needs to impose a sufficient penalty that will dissuade others in positions of trust from acting on impulses or appetites to achieve their own satisfaction at the expense of an innocent child.

Fifth, the Court must take into account the need to protect the public. I find that Mr. Bendann is dangerous. I find that he is capable of getting people to trust him and then after inveigling his way into a family or a school community or another institution, in response to his own sexual appetites, he will strike. Accordingly, to mitigate that danger, he must be incapacitated. He must be incarcerated for a lengthy period.

Sixth, the Court is required to consider the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records and culpability. Counsel for both sides have spent some time discussing other sentences imposed by this Court and by other judges in similar and in dissimilar circumstances where the facts were particularly aggravated and then have made comparisons in terms of length of sentence imposed. The Court is required to go through a process of considering where a particular crime and defendant fits in the wider matrix that is established by all of the sentences that this Court and others impose over time for a variety of offenses, and I have engaged in that process extensively in recent weeks.

Let's discuss some of the circumstances that have been presented to the Court. I'm not going to speak so much to the sentences imposed in the instances of other sex crimes by other judges in this court other than to say that I've heard enough in this hearing to have confidence that the sentence ultimately imposed here will make sense in the context of those other cases.

I want to talk, though, about the very sensitive subject of the prosecution of RICO murder cases in this district, of which, frankly, this Court has had a belly full in the last ten years. It's unfortunately been my duty to impose sentence on more defendants at this point than I can count who have been involved in those cases. It's absolutely true that there have been murderers who have come before this Court and with respect to whom the Court has imposed sentences of 25 years, 30 years, and so forth.

First, let me make this observation. I can't remember a case where a defendant before me was convicted at trial in circumstances giving rise to culpability for first degree murder where the Court didn't impose a life sentence.

Now, in other murder cases, defendants have not proceeded to trial. Sometimes they've actually become cooperators and testified against other members of the gang. Sometimes there are circumstances where there are witnesses who could be called to testify, but they're deeply frightened of their

circumstances and the potential consequences associated with their testifying; and accordingly the Government has entered into a recommended disposition with defense counsel that while not perhaps achieving the length of sentence that is appropriate in the abstract, it makes complete sense in the totality of the circumstances of the particular case because of the risks the witnesses face.

There are other times when agreements of this sort are struck because there is real litigation risk. Witnesses might not show up. God forbid, witnesses might be murdered before the trial is actually completed. In those difficult circumstances which have afflicted our city in the last decade or two, yes, there have been agreements reached and the Government -- the Court has played its part in that regard. And there are people who have been convicted of murder who have received sentences of 25 and 30 years, not life in prison. But it is all explained and understandable in the context of reality.

Mr. Bendann's case does not present a defendant who is cooperating, providing assistance to the Government as they attempt to bring others to justice, cooperating and facing risk for having agreed to testify against other offenders.

Mr. Bendann's case is not one where witnesses lack the courage and the confidence to come forward and state on the public record horribly difficult facts and circumstances but things

This was a straightforward trial. The evidence came in unalloyed by these other issues that I'm describing. The picture was painted, a jury of Mr. Bendann's peers heard it, and they reached their verdicts. I take all of that into account as well when deciding what disparities are appropriate between the sentence imposed in this case and the many others in which I have participated.

The seventh factor the Court is required to consider, the need to provide the defendant with training or treatment. The defendant needs treatment but that treatment can be provided whether he's incarcerated or on supervised release. While I will recommend that he receive treatment in both settings, the need for that treatment I find is not a significant factor in resolving the question of how much incarceration to impose in this case, largely drops out of the analysis.

Last of all, the Court considers the advice of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines. I have faithfully computed the guidelines with the assistance of counsel and the probation office, and I've considered their advice before crafting the sentence in this case.

The lead charges in this case speak of exploitation of a

child and there certainly was that, extensively. But, in addition, there was another feature of this criminal episode: extortion. Extortion carried out over years. And considering its sexual context and the victim's age, it was particularly cruel and harmful. Considering the defendant's age and status as a teacher, advisor, role model and trusted custodian, the crimes were particularly heinous; they deserve a severe consequence reflective of the grievous harm afflicted and the massive breach of trust they embody.

These crimes fall in a special category. When a lawyer steals from an elderly client, when a police officer takes bribes and violates the very law he or she is charged with enforcing, when a teacher takes advantage of the special trust placed in him by parents and the institution that employs him to gratify his own sexual appetite, in any of these situations, we have especially serious deviations from the rules and norms by which our society operates.

Crimes where relationships of trust are violated and exploited are especially bad. Not just because of the harms afflicted on individual victims but also because those crimes tear at relationships that are otherwise essential to our communal lives. Picking up on the earlier examples, we must be able to trust that lawyers will fight for and look out for their clients and not steal from them. We must be able to trust the law enforcement officers won't themselves break the

Mr. Bendann, through his pattern of behavior with the minor victim, a pattern engaged in over many years and then concealed through a pattern of extortion after the child reached adulthood, blatantly broke this norm, this sacred trust imposed on all teachers. And he simultaneously violated relevant statutes that otherwise ensure that such relationships operate within certain guardrails. Mr. Bendann is a violator of public and private trust. He's a criminal. He's a sexual predator.

In violating these norms and in committing these crimes, Mr. Bendann inflicted harm, pain, suffering, physical and psychic injury for years upon his victim. His crimes inflicted collateral harms on a nuclear family, on members of an extended family, and on an otherwise fine educational institution and its wider community of educators, students and those students' families.

When a fundamental trust is broken, a trust such as this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

one, the shards of shattered glass spray far and wide, lacerating many beyond the primary victim. Mr. Bendann has done grave harm. First, of course, to the minor victim but also to these many others in the wider community.

Upon the jury's verdict and because I find that he acted intentionally with a full appreciation for the harms he was inflicting and because these harms were so great, he should and will receive a lengthy sentence, one that is reflective of the extent of the great pain and harm he inflicted.

The sentence that is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set out in Title 18 of the United States Code § 3553(a)(2) is, as to Count 1, 30 years of imprisonment; as to Count 2, 30 years of imprisonment to be served concurrently with the sentence imposed on Count 1; as to Count 3, 30 years of imprisonment to be served concurrently with the sentences imposed on the earlier counts; as to Count 4, 30 years of imprisonment to be served concurrently with the sentences imposed on the earlier counts; Count 5, 30 years of imprisonment to be served concurrently with the sentences imposed on the earlier counts; Count 6, 10 years of imprisonment to be served concurrently with the sentences imposed on the earlier counts; Count 7, 10 years of imprisonment to be served concurrently with the sentences imposed on the earlier counts; Count 8, 10 years of imprisonment to be served concurrently with the sentences

The Court further imposes supervised release terms as follows: First as to Count 1, for life. As to Count 2, for life. As to Count 3, for life. As to Count 4, for life. As to Count 5, for life. As to Count 6, for 3 years. As to Count 7, for 3 years. As to Count 8, for 3 years. As to Count 9, for 3 years, with all terms of supervised release to be served concurrently for a total term of supervised release of life.

Mr. Nieto, I intend now to impose terms and conditions of supervised release on your client. First, I impose the statutory terms and conditions of supervised release which are set out in the relevant statute and of which your client has ample public notice.

But, second, I intend to impose the Maryland standard conditions of supervised release which are recited in the Court's Standing Order 2020-13. Your client is entitled to have those 13 standard conditions read to him explicitly here on the record in open court pursuant to the Court of Appeals' opinion in *Rogers*. However, I will dispense with that reading if, Mr. Nieto, you assure me that you have reviewed each one of those 13 terms and conditions of supervised

```
release, explicitly word for word with your client consistent
1
     with ordinary practice.
2
          Mr. Nieto, did you do that?
3
               MR. PROCTOR: If I can jump in, Your Honor, yes, we
4
     have, both in a jail setting and again today. He understands
5
     as outlined in the presentence report. There's no need to read
6
     them.
7
               THE COURT: Thank you. All 13, Mr. Proctor?
8
               MR. PROCTOR: Yes, sir.
9
               THE COURT:
                           Thank vou.
10
          The Maryland standard conditions of supervision as read to
11
     you by your lawyer today are imposed, numbered 1 through 13,
12
     appearing on pages 25 and 26 of the presentence report.
13
          Also, Mr. Nieto, Mr. Proctor, at the beginning of this
14
     hearing, one or both of you confirmed that you had carefully
15
     reviewed the presentence report with your client. Is that
16
     right, Mr. Nieto?
17
               MR. NIETO: Yes, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: And those conditions are set out on pages
19
     25 and 26, numbered 1 through 13, so that was a second
20
     opportunity or perhaps the primary opportunity to review with
21
     him those conditions.
22
               MR. NIETO: Ergo my hesitancy, Your Honor; I didn't
23
     know you were referencing these. Yes, we reviewed all the
24
     conditions in the final presentence report, ECF 169.
```

```
THE COURT:
                           Does your client expressly waive their
1
     reading to him now?
2
               MR. NIETO: Yes, Your Honor.
3
               THE COURT: Do you, Mr. Bendann?
4
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I do.
5
               THE COURT:
                           There are special conditions of
6
     supervision which I will impose now. Mr. Bendann must not have
7
     direct contact with any child that he knows or reasonably
8
     should know to be under the age of 18, including any of his own
9
     children, without the permission of the probation officer.
                                                                  Ιf
10
     he has any direct contact with any child that he knows or
11
     reasonably knows to be under the age of 18, including his own
12
     children, without the permission of the probation officer, he
13
     must report that contact to the probation officer within 24
14
     hours.
15
          Direct contact includes written communication, in-person
16
     communication or physical contact. Direct contact does not
17
     include incidental conduct during ordinary daily activities in
18
     public places.
19
          Next, the defendant must not communicate or otherwise
20
     interact with the victim of this case as notified by the
21
     Government, either directly or through someone else, without
22
     first obtaining the permission of his probation officer.
23
```

as they are defined in 18 USC § 1030(e)(1), or other electronic

24

25

Next, the defendant must submit any computers that he has,

communications or data storage devices or media to a search.

The defendant must allow the probation officer to install computer monitoring software on any computer, as defined in 18 USC § 1031, that he uses. You must not make any attempt, Mr. Bendann, to circumvent or inhibit the software after its installation. You must pay the cost of computer monitoring as directed by the probation officer.

Next, to ensure compliance with the computer monitoring condition, the defendant must allow the probation officer to conduct initial and periodic unannounced searches of any computers, as defined by the statute I just referred to, subject to computer monitoring. These searches shall be conducted for the purposes of determining whether the computer contains any prohibited data prior to installation of the monitoring software, to determine whether the monitoring software is functioning effectively after its installation, and to determine whether there have been attempts to circumvent the monitoring software after its installation. You must warn any other people who use these computers that the computers may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition.

Next, you must not engage in any occupation, business, profession or volunteer activity that would require or enable you to have contact with minors without the prior approval of the U.S. probation officer.

You must provide the probation officer with access to any

requested financial information and authorize the release of any financial information. The probation office may share financial information with the U.S. Attorney's Office.

You must participate in a mental health treatment program and follow the rules and regulations of that program. The probation officer, in consultation with the treatment provider, will supervise your participation in that program.

You must take all mental health medications that are prescribed by your treating physician.

You must not go to or remain at any place where you know children under the age of 18 are likely to be, including parks, schools, playgrounds and childcare facilities. You must not go to or remain at a place for the primary purpose of observing or contacting children under the age of 18.

You must not view or possess any visual depiction as defined in 18 USC § 2256, including any photograph, film, video, picture or computer or computer-generated image or picture, whether made or produced by electronic, mechanical or other means, of sexually explicit conduct as defined in 18 United States Code § 2256. You must not view or possess any visual depiction as defined in 18 United States Code § 2256, including any photograph, film, video, picture or computer or computer-generated image or picture, whether made or produced by electronic, mechanical or other means of sexually explicit conduct as defined in 18 USC § 2256 that would compromise your

```
sex-offense-specific treatment.
1
          Next, you must participate in a sex-offense-specific
2
     assessment.
3
          Next, you must participate in a sex-offense-specific
4
     treatment program and follow the rules and regulations of that
5
               The probation officer will supervise your
6
     participation in the program.
7
          Next, you must submit to periodic polygraph testing at the
8
     discretion of the probation officer as a means to ensure that
9
    you are in compliance with the requirements of your supervision
10
     or treatment program.
11
          That concludes the special conditions of supervised
12
     release.
13
          Next, I find that the defendant has no ability to pay a
14
     fine; no fine is ordered.
15
          Next, restitution. Ms. McGuinn?
16
               MS. McGUINN: Your Honor, the Government is not
17
     seeking restitution.
18
               THE COURT: No restitution is being sought, very
19
    well.
20
          Forfeiture?
21
               MS. McGUINN: Your Honor, the Government filed a
22
     preliminary order of forfeiture, I believe, on January 15th.
23
     It's ECF 193.
24
                            Right.
               THE COURT:
25
```

THE COURT: Got it. So noted.

This is a variant sentence. The sentence does not fall in the guidelines range but is nonetheless appropriate in light of the Court's findings on the § 3553(a) factors and purposes as follows: This sentence best matches the circumstances and nature of this case.

Now I wish to make the following record. The Court has effectively imposed a prison sentence in this case of 35 years, followed by a lifetime of supervised release. The record should reflect that even had I computed the sentencing guidelines differently and even if I were later to conclude that I was in error with respect to some of the issues or all of them on which the defendant has objected, I would nonetheless exercise the independent discretion that I have to impose a variant sentence outside or inside of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines of 35 years of imprisonment, followed by a lifetime of supervised release for the reason that I find that this was a particularly aggravated offense, the defendant is unrepentant, and the defendant poses a risk and is a danger to the community.

So even if the guidelines were computed differently such that the sentence imposed here were to fall above the relevant guidelines range, the Court would find that there was the necessity for an upward departure to achieve a guideline

Mr. Bendann, you may appeal your conviction. You may also appeal your sentence if you believe it is unlawful. If you wish to appeal either your conviction or your sentence or both, you must file a notice of appeal in this court within 14 days of today. Mr. Bendann, do you understand that deadline?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, and it is ready.

THE COURT: The defendant was previously ordered detained. That detention order did not enter until the trial, as I recall, but it has been of record since then. I take it there is no request from the defense for voluntary surrender or for reconsideration of the detention order at this time?

MR. NIETO: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And, accordingly, the detention order shall remain in effect and voluntary surrender shall be denied.

A judgment and commitment order will be prepared. A statement of reasons will be prepared. These records, together with other appropriate records of the sentencing, will be filed with the United States Sentencing Commission and the United States Bureau of Prisons.

The defendant shall be remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal pending his delivery to the designated

```
place of incarceration. Everyone will stay in place; the
1
     marshals will remove the defendant.
2
               MR. NIETO: Your Honor?
3
               THE COURT: Mr. Nieto.
4
               MR. NIETO: With regards to judgment and commitment
5
     paperwork, if the Court would see it wise to make a
6
     recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons that, if appropriate --
7
               THE COURT: Hold on one second. The marshal will
8
     hold the defendant for one second.
9
               MR. NIETO: Yes. if we could make the recommendation
10
    to the Bureau of Prisons, if appropriate, if he be designated
11
    to either Danbury or Petersburg. In addition, in terms of some
12
    of the classes that he's interested in, culinary arts might be
13
     something he might pursue upon release.
14
               THE COURT: The Court will recommend that the place
15
    of incarceration be the federal correctional institution at
16
    Danbury or -- did you say Petersburg?
17
               MR. NIETO: Yes, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Danbury, Connecticut, or Petersburg,
19
    Virginia, provided that those facilities are appropriate for
20
    the defendant's security level and his programmatic needs. The
21
    Court will not make recommendations with respect to the other
22
     requests the defense counsel have made. I'm sorry, Mr. Nieto,
23
    to have cut you off on that. Is there anything else?
24
               MR. NIETO: No, Your Honor. No, Your Honor.
25
```

```
you.
1
               THE COURT: Take the defendant out.
2
          (Defendant exits the courtroom.)
3
               THE COURT: Mr. Nieto and Mr. Proctor, thank you for
4
     your service in a difficult case in challenging circumstances.
5
     It's been the highest tradition of lawyers in this bar to do
6
     when they are appointed in these circumstances. You don't
7
     choose your clients. We assign you to the case. But we expect
8
     that you will perform professionally, as you did in this
9
     action, and you will leave this afternoon with the Court's
10
     gratitude.
11
          Thank you, you are excused. Counsel are all excused.
12
     Court is in recess.
13
               THE CLERK: All rise. This Honorable Court now
14
     stands adjourned.
15
         (Proceedings concluded at 3:06 p.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER
2	I, Patricia G. Mitchell, Registered Merit Reporter,
3	Certified Realtime Reporter, in and for the United States
4	District Court for the District of Maryland, do hereby certify,
5	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 753, that the foregoing is a true and
6	correct transcript of the stenographically-reported proceedings
7	held in the above-entitled matter and the transcript page
8	format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial
9	Conference of the United States.
LO	Dated this 20th day of February 2025.
1	
L2	Patricia & Mitchell
L3	Patricia G. Mitchell, RMR, CRR
L4	Federal Official Reporter
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
_9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	